

Remarks

The Examiner objected to the drawings because of the small font size of signal line labels. Accordingly, replacement sheets are attached hereto with the appropriate corrections.

The Examiner objected to the Abstract because of inclusion of legal language. Accordingly, the Abstract is amended to overcome this objection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 8-15, 17 and 18 as being anticipated by Wang (US 6,118,817). Wang discloses a video data processing system that employs data compression, motion estimation and adaptive quantization. See Wang, Fig. 1, and associated explanation at col. 6, l. 18 – col. 8, l. 36. The processes of Wang are employed in the context of a host device for employing compression, motion estimation and quantization to maximize utilization of bandwidth and a remote device for reconstructing the image data from the compressed data transmitted from the host device via of a data link. See Wang, Fig. 11, and associated explanation at col. 18, l. 56 – col. 20, l. 27.

Thus, the primary methods of Wang maximize the amount of transmitted information within a fixed bandwidth to enable an acceptable reproduction of a frame of video data. These methods comprise data compression by way of the Discrete Cosine Transform (DCT), motion estimation, and adaptive quantization. This is in contrast to the present invention which intentionally avoids the complexities and loss associated with data compression.

Wang additionally discloses that when a cumulative bandwidth exceeds a threshold, notwithstanding data compression, motion estimation and adaptive quantization, a frame rate controller passes only every n^{th} frame. See Wang, col. 15, l. 37 – col. 16, l. 42. However, Wang discloses *maximization* of the data rate of data transmission within the available bandwidth, whereas, the present invention as recited in the claims *reduces* the data rate of video data transmitted so as not to exceed bandwidth. Wang, col. 4, ll. 26-29. This is a fundamental difference in approach and structure. Note also, that in contrast to the present invention, the frame rate reduction of Wang is only used as a *last resort* and *in addition to compression* to maximize bandwidth utilization, whereas the present invention uses frame rate reduction as a *principal* way to avoid exceeding available bandwidth *without data compression*. Wang, col. 16, ll. 59-64.

Nevertheless, the claims are amended to further differentiate the present invention from Wang. In particular, the claims now recite that the remote device reproduces a frame up to

n times to substantially restore the original frame rate. (See, e.g., specification page 3, ll. 19-27, page 5, ll. 21-26, page 5, l. 32 – page 6, l. 5) This is not disclosed by Wang. Nor does Wang disclose that the method for reducing and restoring the frame rate is compression-less and decompression-less. (See specification, page 3, ll. 10-12, page 2, ll. 21-29) Nor does Wang disclose that the remote device reproduces a frame more than n times to produce a frame rate greater than the original frame rate as recited in new claims 19 and 20. (See specification, page 5, l. 32 – page 6, l. 5, page 13, ll. 16-21) Further, with respect to claims 14 and 21, Wang does not disclose, teach or suggest, transmitting information about the reduced frame rate to the remote device used for substantially restoring the original frame rate or increasing the frame rate.

Conclusion:

For these reasons, Applicant believes the application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,



Date: 2/12/07

Patrick Stellitano, Reg. No. 42,169
2803 Inridge Dr., Austin, TX 78745
Tel: 512/899-8038, Fax: 512/535-7413